

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application and stand rejected. No claims have been amended in this paper; the listing of claims is provided solely for the convenience of the Examiner.

### **Rejection of Claims 1-2 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Schneiderman In View of Kreller et al.**

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites a method for a mobile agent object to dynamically extend its capabilities including configuring the mobile agent object to install a service object executable in a mobile-agent runtime environment. The mobile agent object is operable to execute in a first electronic device, halt execution in the first electronic device at an execution state, be transplanted to a second electronic device, and resume execution from the execution state in the second electronic device.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Schneiderman fails to teach or suggest configuring a mobile agent to install a service object to be executable in a mobile-agent runtime environment. However, contrary to the Examiner's stated position, Kreller et al. likewise fails to teach or suggest configuring a mobile agent to install a service object to be executable in a mobile-agent runtime environment.

The Examiner cites col. 3, lines 11-17 of Kreller as teaching configuring a mobile agent to install a service object to be executable in a mobile-agent runtime environment. However, col. 3, lines 11-19 of Kreller read as follows: "[t]he agent system, which can be installed on computers connected in a computer network, has an agent platform and an agent system controller. The agent platform comprises service programs required by a mobile agent in order to be able to be executed on the respective computer. The agent system controller contains an agent system launcher which can be loaded onto a client computer independently of the rest of the agent system and is used for loading the agent system from a host computer."

As such, assuming solely for the sake of argument that the “service programs” taught by Kreller are the equivalent of “service objects” as contemplated by claim 1 (which, Applicant submits, they are not), neither this passage nor any other passage of Kreller teaches or suggests that a mobile agent installs, or is otherwise configured to install, the service programs. As can be seen in the above passage, Kreller simply states that an agent platform comprises service programs required by a mobile agent; Kreller fails in any manner to teach that such service programs are installed by the mobile agent itself, which is a key limitation of claim 1. If the Examiner disagrees with this position, and to better enable a fair chance for the Applicant to respond, the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out in the Kreller reference the specific activity considered to be configuring the mobile agent to install a service object, and the specific reference to installation of the service object. Alternatively, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

### **Claims 2 and 13**

Claims 2 and 13 are patentable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1.

### **Rejection of Claims 3 and 4-11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Schneiderman In View of Kreller and Yokoyama**

### **Claims 3-6**

As stated by Applicant’s attorney in a previously submitted paper, Yokoyama fails in any manner to supply the teachings missing from Schneiderman and Kreller, namely a mobile object capable of installing service objects, or for that matter, anything, executable in a mobile-agent runtime environment. In fact, and as also stated by Applicant’s attorney in a previous paper, a thorough reading of Yokoyama reveals that the Yokoyama reference fails to even so much as use the terms “install,” “installation” or the like. As such, Schneiderman, Kreller and Yokoyama,

taken either each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 2. Consequently, claims 3-6 are patentable for at least the reason of their dependency from claim 2.

**Claim 7**

Claim 7 is patentable for reasons at least similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 2.

**Claims 8-11**

Claims 8-11 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from claim 7.

**Rejection of Claim 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over  
Schneiderman In View of Kreller and Further In View of Wang**

Wang fails to supply the teachings missing from Schneiderman and Kreller, namely a data structure comprising a first instruction set that when executed by a computing device causes the data structure to navigate from a first host computing environment to a second host computing environment having a mobile-agent runtime environment, and a second instruction set that when executed by a computing device causes the installation of a service object executable in the mobile-agent runtime environment and that may be called by any process or subsequent mobile-agent object that is executing in the mobile-agent runtime environment. As such Schneiderman, Kreller and Wang, taken each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 7. Accordingly, claim 12 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 7.

**Rejection of Claim 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over  
Schneiderman In View of Kreller and Saulpaugh**

Saulpaugh fails in any manner to supply the teachings missing from Schneiderman and Kreller, namely a mobile object capable of installing service objects executable in a mobile-agent runtime environment. As such, Schneiderman, Kreller and Saulpaugh, taken either each alone or

in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 2. Consequently, claim 14 is patentable for at least the reason of its dependency from claim 2.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant requests a finding of allowability for all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. **If the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant's position that all pending claims are allowable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange a telephonic discussion of the application prior to issuing an Office Action rejecting any of the claims based on the cited references.**

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM<sup>PLLC</sup>

*/P.G. Scott Born/*

P.G. Scott Born  
Registration No. 40,523  
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491